

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this reply, Claims 1 and 4 are amended. Claims 9-16 are added. Therefore, Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, amendments made to the claims as indicated herein have been made to exclusively improve readability and clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of overcoming alleged prior art.

CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,249,121 (“Bharat”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,179 (“Evans”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Among other features, Claim 1 as amended recites, “wherein the compound word is a single unspaced word; and wherein the component word is a sequence of two or more letters within the compound word.” Neither Bharat nor Evans discloses such features. Therefore, even if combined, Bharat and Evans do not disclose the method of Claim 1.

In Bharat’s approach, a “compound” is always **at least two separate words separated by spaces** (see, e.g., col. 1, lines 55-60; Bharat’s “compound” is a “semantic unit” that comprises multiple separate words like “baldur’s gate,” but is not a **single word**). All of the examples of “compounds” in Bharat’s approach are strings that comprise **multiple space-separated words** (e.g., “baldur’s gate,” “country western,” “mp3 download,” “western migration,” etc.). There is no example in Bharat’s approach where a “compound” is a **single word**. The meaning of “compound” in Bharat’s approach is **not** a single word like the term “**compound word**” in Claim 1 indicates. Even if Bharat’s approach involves something that Bharat calls “compounds,” Bharat’s approach does not involve **compound words** of the kind that are described in the Applicant’s application and recited in Claim 1 of that application.

In Evans’ approach, a bitmap of a document is searched for portions that correspond to words, and the portions that correspond to the words are displayed in a manner that is different

from the manner in which the remainder of the document (non-word images) is displayed. It is **never** the case in Evans that a component word that is made up of a sequence of two or more characters **within a single compound word** is displayed differently from the remainder of that **compound word**. In Evans' approach, for each word in a document, the **entirety** of that word is displayed in the same manner. In Evan's approach, it is **never** the case that a mere **portion** (less than the whole) of a **single compound word** is displayed in a manner that is different from the manner in which the **remainder of that compound word** is displayed. Even if some words are displayed in a different manner than other words in Evan's approach, it is always that case in Evans' approach that a **whole** word will be displayed in one manner only, regardless of which manner that is.

Therefore, neither Bharat nor Evans teaches, discloses, or suggests "wherein the compound word is a single unspaced word; and wherein the component word is a sequence of two or more letters within the compound word." Because these are features that neither of the cited references discloses individually, even a hypothetical combination of Bharat and Evans still would not "read on" the method of Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 1 and the claims that depend from Claim 1 are patentable over Bharat and Evans, regardless of whether those references are considered individually or in combination.

Among other features, Claim 4 as amended recites, "wherein the first compound word is a single unspaced word; wherein the second compound word is a single unspaced word; wherein the component word is a sequence of two or more letters within the first compound word and the second compound word." As is discussed above in connection with Claim 1, neither Bharat nor Evans discloses such features; Bharat's "compounds" are **not** single unspaced compound words, and Evans does not disclose that a portion of a single unspaced compound word is displayed in a different manner than the manner in which the rest of such a compound word is displayed.

Therefore, neither Bharat nor Evans teaches, discloses, or suggests "wherein the first compound word is a single unspaced word; wherein the second compound word is a single unspaced word; wherein the component word is a sequence of two or more letters within the first

compound word and the second compound word.” Because these are features that neither of the cited references discloses individually, even a hypothetical combination of Bharat and Evans still would not “read on” the method of Claim 4. Consequently, Claim 4 and the claims that depend from Claim 4 are patentable over Bharat and Evans, regardless of whether those references are considered individually or in combination.

The Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 9-16 are also patentable over the cited references, whether considered individually or in combination, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with the independent claims from which those new claims depend.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: January 18, 2008

/ChristianANicholes#50,266/
Christian A. Nicholes
Reg. No. 50,266

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076